

NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL

Monterey, California



ATTRITION REPORTING IN NAVY TECHNICAL TRAINING

Alice M. Crawford
and
Robert L. Firehammer

September 1990

NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL
Monterey, California

RADM. R. W. West, Jr.
Superintendent

Harrison Shull
Provost

The research summarized herein was sponsored by the Deputy Chief of Naval Operations (Manpower, Personnel, and Training), OP-112C1.

Reproduction of all or part of this report is authorized.

This report was prepared by:

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

REPORT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION Unclassified			1b RESTRICTIVE MARKINGS			
SECURITY CLASSIFICATION AUTHORITY			3 DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY OF REPORT Approved for Public Release; Distribution unlimited.			
DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE			5 MONITORING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S)			
PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S) S-54-90-019			7a NAME OF MONITORING ORGANIZATION Chief of Naval Operations (OP-112C1)			
NAME OF PERFORMING ORGANIZATION Naval Postgraduate School			6b OFFICE SYMBOL (If applicable) AS		7b ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) Chief of Naval Operations (OP-112C1) Washington, DC 20350-2000	
ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) Monterey, California 93943			8a OFFICE SYMBOL (If applicable)		9 PROCUREMENT INSTRUMENT IDENTIFICATION NUMBER N000149OWR35031	
NAME OF FUNDING/SPONSORING ORGANIZATION (OP-112C1) Chief of Naval Operations			10 SOURCE OF FUNDING NUMBERS		PROGRAM ELEMENT NO	
ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) Chief of Naval Operations (OP-112C1) Washington, DC 20350-2000			PROJECT NO		TASK NO	
TITLE (Include Security Classification) ATTRITION REPORTING IN NAVY TECHNICAL TRAINING (UNCLASSIFIED)			WORK UNIT ACCESSION NO			
PERSONAL AUTHOR(S) Crawford, A. M., and Firehammer, R. L.						
TYPE OF REPORT Final		13b TIME COVERED FROM _____ TO _____		14 DATE OF REPORT (Year, Month, Day) September 1990		15 PAGE COUNT
SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION						
COSAT CODES			18 SUBJECT TERMS (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number)			
FIELD	GROUP	SUB GROUP	ATTRITION REPORTING; "A" SCHOOLS: DECISION MAKING; TECHNICAL TRAINING; ACADEMIC REVIEW BOARDS.			
ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number) This study examines academic review board (ARB) decision making in Navy technical training in relation to standardization in the system for reporting training attrition. The results of a survey show differences in procedures across the schools sampled, and that there is fairly high agreement among ARB members about the value of the factors they consider deciding to setback or attrite students in training. The study also includes a discussion of ARB member perceptions of the effects of the school's policy to keep training attrition low. The recommendations address the differences found, but also point out that the accuracy of ARB decisions is still unknown. A study of the costs and fleet performance of original students would provide a concrete basis for establishing attrition low policy.						
DISTRIBUTION AVAILABILITY OF ABSTRACT UNCLASSIFIED/UNLIMITED <input type="checkbox"/> SAME AS RPT <input type="checkbox"/> DTIC USERS <input type="checkbox"/>			21 ABSTRACT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION Unclassified			
NAME OF RESPONSIBLE INDIVIDUAL M. Crawford			22b TELEPHONE (Include Area Code) (408) 646-2481		22c OFFICE SYMBOL AS/Cr	

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Introduction.	1
A.	Background.	1
B.	Research Questions.	10
II.	Methodology.	12
A.	Subjects.	12
B.	Questionnaire.	14
C.	Procedures.	14
III.	Results and Discussion.	17
A.	Procedural Differences.	17
B.	Agreement in Decision Making.	23
C.	Additional Attrition-Related Questions.	37
IV.	Conclusions and Recommendations.	42
A.	Conclusions.	42
B.	Recommendations.	43
	List of References.	46
	Appendix A: Instructional Staff Representation By School. .	47
	Appendix B: ARB Questionnaire.	48
	Appendix C: Setback for Academic Reasons By School Group. .	57
	Appendix D: Drop for Academic Reasons By School Group. . .	58
	Appendix E: Setback for Nonacademic Reasons By School Group.	59
	Appendix F: Drop for Nonacademic Reasons By School Group. .	60

LIST OF TABLES

	<u>Page</u>
Table 1	School Groupings. 14
Table 2	Student Characteristics Considered by ARB Members. 16
Table 3	Average Length of an ARB. 19
Table 4	Communication Between Academic Schools and ASMTs. 20
Table 5	Maximum Number of Setbacks A Board Member Would Give. 21
Table 6	ARB Member's Knowledge of Student Action Codes. . 22
Table 7	Relative and Mean Rankings of Student Factors For Type of Decision. 26
Table 8	How Motivation is Judged. 28
Table 9	Value of the Student's ASVAB Score to the ARB. . 29
Table 10	Personal Information Used by the ARB. 31
Table 11	Factors Considered When Making Professional Judgments. 32
Table 12	Agreement Coefficients by School Group and Type of Decision. 37
Table 13	Value of a RLJP. 38
Table 14	Difficulty of the School's Curriculum. 39
Table 15	ARB Members Perceptions About The Change in Attrition. 39

ATTRITION REPORTING IN NAVY TECHNICAL TRAINING

ABSTRACT

This study examines academic review board (ARB) decision making in Navy technical training in relation to standardization in the system for reporting training attrition. The results of a survey show differences in ARB procedures across the schools sampled, and that there is fairly high agreement among ARB members about the value of the factors they consider in deciding to setback or attrite students in training. The study also includes a discussion of ARB member perceptions of the effects of the Navy's policy to keep training attrition low. The recommendations address the differences found, but also point out that the accuracy of ARB decisions is still unknown. A study of the costs and fleet performance of marginal students would provide a concrete basis for establishing attrition policy.

I. INTRODUCTION

The loss of resources through attrition from Navy technical training programs is a concern, particularly at the initial skill training level in the "A" schools. Interventions designed to decrease attrition are driven by the attrition reporting system, which provides the data to show the specific causes that must be addressed. In this context, the Navy is dependent upon accuracy and standardization in attrition reporting.

Academic Review Boards (ARBs) within each Navy school may recommend attrition of students due to poor academic performance resulting from any of several causes. The purpose of this research is to investigate standardization in ARB decision making procedures.

A. BACKGROUND

Navy training commands provide specialized skill training for a wide variety of jobs for enlisted personnel. Training levels range from initial rate training at "A" schools to progression training at the more advanced "C" schools and highly technical "F" schools. For the most part, new recruits do not enter the Navy with the skills required to perform effectively on the job. Therefore, most graduates from Recruit Training Commands (RTCs) go directly to "A" schools.

"A" school training is the most cost-effective means of

training recruits for most of their initial assignments in the fleet. [Ref. 1] The projected student input totals for "A" school attendance are 128,049 for FY91 and 126,603 for FY92. However, the projected graduation totals are 117,411 and 116,161, respectively, for the same time period. [Ref. 2] The difference of the two totals (over 10,000 students for each year) represents a significant loss of resources in the form of student drops from training.

In relation to "A" schools, "C" school attrition is not a major concern. The current average of "C" school attrition is 3.0 percent. There are a some significant differences between "A" school students and "C" school students, which might explain the differences in average attrition rates. "A" school students usually come directly from RTCs, most are 18 to 20 years of age, they have not fully acclimated themselves to the military way of life, they may not possess the discipline to succeed in the military training environment, and as the training progresses they may question their desire to obtain that particular skill. Conversely, "C" school students usually come from fleet units, they have already completed their initial skill training, and have added fleet experience to that knowledge base. These students have been closely evaluated by their superiors in the fleet and have been recommended for follow-on training. Consequently, when "C" school students arrive for training, most have the maturity, discipline, and motivation to complete their course

of instruction.

Thus, the Navy's concern for attrition from specialized skill training is focused primarily on the "A" schools where student losses are the highest. Considerable attention has been paid to reducing "A" school attrition through research and development, and working groups have been formed to address the problem.

Most of the research on "A" school attrition has looked at the effects that student characteristics such as mental ability or level of education have on academic and nonacademic attrition. [Ref. 3] Other studies have examined the impact of technical and non-technical courses on academic and nonacademic attrition patterns. [Refs. 4,5]

In 1987, the Chief of Naval Education and Training (CNET), established a "Model Schools Program." [Ref.6] The intent of the program was to improve training by

...bringing available resources into contact with a Navy school and collectively working together with the school management staff to identify problems that impede school success and develop solutions that can be implemented by the school staff. [Ref. 7]

The EM-A school was designated as the first model school in which activities used to improve training in this environment could be transitioned to other technical training schools. Given the broad spectrum of improvements introduced to training in the model schools context, reduced attrition would not be an unexpected result for the schools that become part of the program.

Another CNET group, the Training Efficacy Quality Management Board, sponsors and distributes a lessons learned letter to its training commands. The letter is a compilation of the effective actions taken by the commands that have been successful in curbing their schools' attrition. The letter allows the schools to review the actions taken by other schools. [Ref. 8]

The purpose of the present research effort is to explore how decisions are made to drop students from training, and to determine if there is standardization in the decision making process. Accuracy and standardization in these decisions are essential in order to develop appropriate programs to reduce attrition.

1. "A" School Training

Navy "A" school student enrollment is comprised primarily of students coming directly from the RTCs, although a small percentage comes from fleet units. Each student must meet some minimum entrance requirement to be admitted into the school-- usually a minimum total Armed Forces Vocational Aptitude Battery (ASVAB) score or a minimum score on several of the ASVAB sub-tests. The newly reporting student participates in school indoctrination, which may last from several days to three weeks depending on the school and the student. Part of the indoctrination phase may require a battery of reading and arithmetic tests. The schools use

these tests to determine the student's knowledge of the basic skills, which are necessary to complete the training program. Students who do not pass these exams remain in the indoctrination phase and receive remediation on their skill deficiencies. Students who fail remediation do not continue with the training pipeline and eventually are reassigned to other duty. Students who continue with training are assigned to an academic class and an "A" School Military Training Company (ASMT). The ASMT provides the students with a continuation of the general military training and physical fitness conditioning they received as recruits.

The "A" school companies maintain a record on each student consisting of all the military training the student receives, any violations of school policy, military deficiencies, and any other personal information that may seem necessary. If a student commits an offense against school policy, he/she may go before a military review board (MRB). The MRBs are used to correct the student's military deficiencies; however, if the problem persists, the board can recommend the student be dropped from training. Offenses of a more serious nature are handled at Officer in Charge Mast or Captain's Mast; both can result in dropping a student from training.

The academic curriculum of an "A" school may be divided into phases. The school may have both military instructors, usually Second Class Petty Officers and above, and contracted civilians. The instructors teach just one segment of the

Another CNET group, the Training Efficacy Quality Management Board, sponsors and distributes a lessons learned letter to its training commands. The letter is a compilation of the effective actions taken by the commands that have been successful in curbing their schools' attrition. The letter allows the schools to review the actions taken by other schools. [Ref. 8]

The purpose of the present research effort is to explore how decisions are made to drop students from training, and to determine if there is standardization in the decision making process. Accuracy and standardization in these decisions are essential in order to develop appropriate programs to reduce attrition.

1. "A" School Training

Navy "A" school student enrollment is comprised primarily of students coming directly from the RTCs, although a small percentage comes from fleet units. Each student must meet some minimum entrance requirement to be admitted into the school-- usually a minimum total Armed Forces Vocational Aptitude Battery (ASVAB) score or a minimum score on several of the ASVAB sub-tests. The newly reporting student participates in school indoctrination, which may last from several days to three weeks depending on the school and the student. Part of the indoctrination phase may require a battery of reading and arithmetic tests. The schools use

these tests to determine the student's knowledge of the basic skills, which are necessary to complete the training program. Students who do not pass these exams remain in the indoctrination phase and receive remediation on their skill deficiencies. Students who fail remediation do not continue with the training pipeline and eventually are reassigned to other duty. Students who continue with training are assigned to an academic class and an "A" School Military Training Company (ASMT). The ASMT provides the students with a continuation of the general military training and physical fitness conditioning they received as recruits.

The "A" school companies maintain a record on each student consisting of all the military training the student receives, any violations of school policy, military deficiencies, and any other personal information that may seem necessary. If a student commits an offense against school policy, he/she may go before a military review board (MRB). The MRBs are used to correct the student's military deficiencies; however, if the problem persists, the board can recommend the student be dropped from training. Offenses of a more serious nature are handled at Officer in Charge Mast or Captain's Mast; both can result in dropping a student from training.

The academic curriculum of an "A" school may be divided into phases. The school may have both military instructors, usually Second Class Petty Officers and above, and contracted civilians. The instructors teach just one segment of the

training phase, and a training phase may be made up of many training segments. Students are tested upon completion of each segment of training. Students who fail the test receive remediation including a reexamination. Students who pass remediation usually continue with their class, students who fail receive a mandatory Academic Review Board (ARB).

2. Academic Review Boards

"All Apprentice Training, Class 'AP,' 'A,' and NEC awarding 'C' schools are required to convene ARBs for attrition and setback decisions." [Ref. 9:p. 2] The primary function of the ARB is to enhance student academic progress and to deter student failure. Along with that primary duty, the board must make an unbiased determination of whether the student has the motivation and ability to complete the training. An ARB is initiated by the student's Phase Chief at the request of the student's instructor for a given training segment. An ARB may be convened for any one of the following five reasons: (1) the student is recommended for acceleration through training; (2) the student fails to meet course learning objectives and after remedial study fails the retests; (3) the student continually fails course learning objectives, even though he/she passes all remedial exams; (4) the student's laboratory performance is consistently below standard; or (5) the student fails remediation for a learning objective following an ARB recommendation to continue with the

class. [Ref. 9]

The ARB consists of four members chosen from the instructional staff, which includes officer and enlisted instructional/supervisory personnel, classroom and learning center instructors, and education/training specialists.

Supervisory personnel who have command designated authority for approval/disapproval of ARB recommendations may not sit as members of the ARB. Those personnel responsible for completing student personnel and reclassification actions may not sit as ARB members. The board is chaired by the senior member and there are two other voting members as well as one non-voting recorder. After examining all the available relevant data, the board conducts an interview with the student. During the interview, the board attempts to gain information on any problems the student may be having that could cause the student's academic problems. Once the ARB is satisfied that they have reviewed all the available information, the board makes a recommendation on the student's future training status. If the board is able to determine the student's problem, it can initiate appropriate corrective actions. However, the board must make one of four recommendations: (1) continue the student with class, with or without remediation; (2) setback to the next class, with or without remediation; (3) accelerate to the next class; or (4) drop from training.

If the board's recommendation is to drop the student from training, it must also make a further recommendation to

transfer the student directly to the fleet for general detail, reclassify the student to another rating, or separate the student from service. For the board to recommend that the student continue with the class or setback to another class, there must be clear evidence that the student has the ability and the motivation to complete the training. To recommend a student be dropped from training, the student must show an unwillingness or an inability to complete the training.

The ARB's recommendation is accompanied by a student action code (SAC). The SAC is a three digit code that indicates the type of action taken by the board and in those cases when a student is dropped from training, the SAC will also indicate why the student was dropped. The student action codes were expanded on 1 October 1990 by CNET to give a more accurate picture of school attrition patterns. The SACS are separated into two categories, academic and nonacademic, and the nonacademic category is further separated into sub-categories for motivation, medical, administrative, and disciplinary reasons. When a school drops a student from training, the ARB may give an academic SAC or a nonacademic SAC from the motivation category. A nonacademic SAC assigned by an ARB should not be confused with a nonacademic SAC for disciplinary reasons, which would be assigned by an MRB. Following the approval required for the various board recommendations, the SAC is entered into the Navy Integrated Training Administrative System (NITRAS) database, which is

updated daily. NITRAS is the data base for all Navy training, that provides Naval training administrators a means to track the progress of students' training through their Naval careers. The data can be aggregated by school to determine attrition and setback patterns for every course offered.

The accuracy of the attrition information that is input into the database is directly related to the care of the ARB procedures and the proper assignment of SACs by the individual training commands. The concern over the accuracy of the NITRAS database is reflected by the following extract from a CNTT instruction:

The accuracy and care involved in student coding at the ARB level is fundamental to the creation of an accurate and meaningful data base of attrition information. This information may be used as a basis for administrative and management decisions and research studies, and it may influence assignment procedures. [Ref. 9:p. 2]

This research will address the accuracy of these data in the context of decision making at ARBs.

3. Decision Making

Naval training schools rely on a small groups to make decisions concerning attrition. Because of this, individual differences and group dynamics become a part of the decision making process. Ideally, a board's decision is made free of any influences other than those brought to the board, i.e., the student's academic record and the results of the board's interview with the student. However, there may be other

influences, some from outside the board, and some within the board, that affect the board's ultimate recommendation. For example, serving as the chairman may give that individual some influence over the other board members. By instruction, the chairman is the senior member present and may be an immediate superior to one of the other board members. Similarly, one board member may influence other board members through strength of conviction. Or, one or more of the board members

may empathize with the student's plight due to having similar demographic characteristics or a similar background. [Ref. 10] Individuals with approval/disapproval authority may influence the board's decision through actions on past board recommendations, or through other forms of communication of their wishes. Perceptions of the school's effectiveness by external and internal organizations may drive a board's decision.

Thus, groups dynamics, which are known to impact decision making, would most certainly be expected to be present in the process of making a decision at an ARB where a large component of subjective evaluation is required. Poor communications, status of group members, conformity, group polarization, group experience, and individual personalities could all impact the standardization of ARB decisions. [Ref. 10]

B. RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The present research was initiated because of CNTT's

concern over the accuracy and standardization of attrition reporting particularly in the "A" schools. In response to CNTT's concerns, three questions are examined:

1. Do differences exist among the schools' ARB procedures that could promote either inaccuracy or decreased standardization in attrition reporting?

2. How much agreement is there among the ARB members concerning the evaluation of student characteristics for a given ARB decision?

3. What other information can be captured that sheds light on the attrition ARB decision?

By determining how school personnel make their decisions during the ARB process, information can be acquired that will help improve the attrition reporting process.

II. METHODOLOGY

A. SUBJECTS

The subjects of this study were the ARB members from eight "A" Schools and the Advanced Electronics School (AES), which incorporates many of the electronic "C" Schools. The "C" schools were included to determine if they conduct their ARBs differently than the "A" schools. Seven of the "A" Schools and AES are part of Service School Command (SERVSCHLCOM), in San Diego, California. The other "A" School is Data Systems "A" (DS-A) school, which is part of Combat Systems Technical School Command located at Mare Island, California. SERVSCCLCOM, is the largest training command that provides initial skill training on the West Coast. It is home for the following "A" Schools: Radioman "A" (RM-A), Interior Communications "A" (IC-A), Data Processor "A" (DP-A), Mess Specialist "A" (MS-A), Molder "A" (ML-A), Pattern Maker "A" (PM-A), and Machinery Repairman "A" (MR-A). The output from the seven "A" Schools represents 20 percent of the FY89 graduation total for all CNTT controlled "A" Schools. [Ref. 11] RM-A and IC-A are among 15 "A" schools that have the highest attrition rates.

The study surveyed 91 ARB members, who represented varying percentages of their school's instructional staff. The representation ranged from 5.3 percent from the AES to 71.0 percent for IC-A school. Appendix A provides a complete list

of the school's instructional staff representation. However, not all the instructional staff may be qualified to sit on an ARB. Discussion with the various school representatives indicated that the study captured most of the eligible ARB members associated with the respective schools.

The ARB members averaged 14 years of service with 25 months at their present command. Forty seven percent of the respondents were Second Class and First Class Petty Officers, 32 percent were Chief Petty Officers, 17 percent were Senior Chief and Master Chief Petty Officers, and four percent were Warrant or Line Officers. Additionally, their ARB experience averaged over 75 ARBs and those who had experience as the chairman had over 40 ARBs in that capacity.

The ARB members were separated into four groups for the analysis (see Table 1) because several schools (ML-A, MR-A, PM-A, DP-A) are small and have few ARB members. The schools were grouped by those that report to the same Officer in Charge (OIC). At SERVSCHLCOM, ML-A, MS-A, MR-A, AND PM-A are known as the 3300 level schools and report to the same OIC; IC-A and DP-A also report to the same OIC. The information gathered from DS-A school was evaluated only with respect to ARB procedures.

TABLE 1
SCHOOL GROUPINGS

Group 1	RM-A
Group 2	IC-A, DP-A
Group 3	(3300 Level) MR-A, MS-A, PM-A, ML-A
Group 4	AES

B. QUESTIONNAIRE

The ARB members responded to a 29 item questionnaire, which is presented in Appendix B. The design of the questionnaire was based on information gathered from two sets of interviews with the ARB members from DS-A School. The first set of interviews was conducted to gather information about ARB procedures. The second set of interviews included observation of several ARBs and follow-up questions between each board to further define the student characteristics being considered when evaluating each student. Uncertainties in the wording of some questions on the questionnaire were examined with assistance from CNTT.

C. PROCEDURES

The questionnaires were administered to ARB members at the four groups of schools on separate days. The respondents received an initial briefing on the purpose of the study, with specific emphasis on the study objectives. Subjects were encouraged to try to add relevant comments that had not been

asked on the questionnaire. No time limit was set on completing the questionnaire, however, all respondents had to complete it before leaving the room.

The first four questions required the respondents to evaluate nine student characteristics shown in Table 2, specifically focusing on the value each factor contributes to the decision making process. The values for the responses ranged from 1 = not at all important--rarely used, to 5 = extremely important--critical factor. The nine factors were evaluated over four possible types of decisions: (1) to drop a student from training for academic reasons, (2) to drop a student from training for non-academic reasons, (3) to setback a student for academic reasons, and (4) to setback a student for non-academic reasons.

The remaining 25 questions asked the respondents to elaborate on how they judge certain student characteristics, and how their organization's ARB and attrition reporting systems work.

TABLE 2

STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS CONSIDERED BY ARB MEMBERS

1. Academic record	acadrec
2. Military record	milrec
3. Personal information about the student	
persinfo	
4. ASVAB scores	asvab
5. Amount of night study	nghtstdy
6. Recommendations made to the board	rectobrd
7. Professional judgement about whether the student will make a good sailor	prfjdgment
8. Student attitude/motivation	stdtmot
9. High school graduate (or not)	hsdg

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The results of this study are presented in the context of the three study questions proposed in the introduction:

1. Do differences exist among the schools' ARB procedures that could promote either inaccuracy or decreased standardization in attrition reporting?
2. How much agreement is there among the ARB members concerning the evaluation of student factors for a given ARB decision?
3. What other information can be captured that sheds light on the attrition process?

A. PROCEDURAL DIFFERENCES

A number of distinct differences were found among the schools' ARB procedures, which could potentially affect the standardization of attrition reporting. The information addressed in this section was gathered in part from general discussions with school personnel. Additionally, some of the data generated by the questionnaire that was administered (see Appendix B) are presented here. Differences among specific schools are included where they are relevant to the discussion.

First, who is present at a student's ARB may affect the board's decision. In addition to the required board composition, some schools have the student's instructor present to elaborate on his/her recommendations concerning the student's academic abilities and to answer other

specific questions that may shed more light on the student's problems.

Just as important in influencing a board's decisions are those incidents that limit the board's make-up, i.e., assigning one to two individuals as permanent chairperson for all ARBs, which was the policy at one school sampled. The chairman of an ARB has positional power over the other board members and in that capacity might exert more influence over the board's decision. Therefore, the ARB's decisions over time could reflect individual biases that those members would consistently bring to each ARB.

The manner of conducting an ARB may also affect a board's decision. Some of the schools conduct their ARBs in a relaxed, congenial atmosphere. This is done in an attempt to promote a more open discussion with the student, which would allow the board to accurately assess the student's problems and future potential. Other schools conduct the board in a more traditionally military environment with the student standing in front of the board members at parade rest. The intent of this approach is to create a professional environment. Some schools use a checklist to evaluate their ARB's conduct and procedures. This evaluation by the school's instructional staff occurs several times each month.

The length of an ARB can vary from board to board, the shortest board may last only a couple of minutes, while some boards last as long as one and a half hours. Table 3 shows

the average length of time an ARB usually lasts for a given student. On average, 70 percent of the boards last between 10 and 30 minutes, 26 percent last longer than 30 minutes, while approximately three percent of the boards last less than ten minutes. There were no time differences as a function of the school at which the board was held.

TABLE 3
AVERAGE LENGTH OF AN ARB
(Question 13)

During an ARB, about how much time is spent on each student? Give a range (max/min) and an average.

less than 10 minutes	3.5%
10 to 20 minutes	36.8%
20 to 30 minutes	33.3%
30 to 40 minutes	13.8%
greater than 40 minutes	12.6%

Percentages are based on 87 responses.

As noted earlier, the student's time is divided between academic classes and duties in the ASMT. However, not all schools examine the student's military performance to the same extent at an ARB. Some schools have ASMT instructional staff sit on the ARBs as voting members. These schools believe they receive more information and can make a more accurate determination about the student's training status.

Another indication of a school's evaluation of the student's military performance is the amount of communication between the academic sections and the ASMTs. From Table 4, it can be seen that RM-A school and IC/DP-A school have the least amount of communication with their associated ASMTs. Conversely, the 3300 level schools (MR-A, MS-A, PM-A, and ML-A) have considerable communication with their ASMT. The AES reported the most communication with their associated military side, however, the "C" schools do not have ASMTs. They may be responding with respect to their accessibility to the student's service record.

TABLE 4

COMMUNICATION BETWEEN ACADEMIC SCHOOLS
AND ASMTs (Question 25)

How much communication is there here between the Military Training Divisions and the academic sections on student progress?

	RM-A	IC/DP-A	3300	AES
None	61.5%	14.6%	6.2%	11.1%
Occasional	38.5%	56.2%	25.0%	0%
Considerable	0%	29.2%	68.8%	88.9%
N	13	41	16	9

One of the important decisions a board must face is whether to setback a student or drop that student from training. Usually, before a student is dropped from training

he/she will be setback at least once. The number of setbacks a student receives will vary depending on the individual case. However, the likelihood of setting back a student may also vary by the school. Table 5 presents the number of setbacks a board member would give to a student before deciding to drop that student from training.

TABLE 5

MAXIMUM NUMBER OF SETBACKS
A BOARD MEMBER WOULD GIVE (Question 27)

What is the maximum number of setbacks you would give any student?

	RM-A	IC/DP-A	3300	AES
No setbacks	8.3%	2.1%	11.8%	9.1%
One setback	8.3%	0	35.3%	45.4%
Two setbacks	58.3%	38.3%	29.4%	36.4%
Three setbacks	25.0%	57.5%	23.5%	9.1%
More than three	0	2.1%	0	0
N	12	47	17	11

The table shows that the majority of the RM-A school members prefer to give the student two setbacks. The IC/DP-A school favors setting the student back three times before dropping that student from training. The 3300-level schools and the AES are less certain, with both schools slightly favoring just one setback before dropping the student. In some cases, when it seems obvious that the board will decide to setback the

student, the student is physically setback to the next class prior to the board convening.

The last item a board must consider is the assignment of the SAC. The accuracy of assigning the SAC is essential for maintaining an accurate NITRAS database. However, Table 6 shows a wide range of knowledge about student action codes across the schools. Many of the ARB members who found the SACs hard to use had problems with only a small number of the many SACs provided.

TABLE 6
ARB MEMBER'S KNOWLEDGE
OF STUDENT ACTION CODES (Question 19)

Which of the SACs are confusing or hard to use in any way, and why?

	RM-A	IC/DP-A	3300	AES
No problems with SACs	25.0%	52.6%	53.3%	20.0%
SACs are confusing	8.3%	23.7%	26.7%	0%
Do not use or have no knowledge	66.7%	23.7%	20.0%	80.0%
N	12	38	15	10

Some of the lack of knowledge concerning the SACs may be due to the fact that at some ARBs the chairman is the only member who assigns the SAC. Additionally, some of the board members stated that they did not evaluate their students for

nonacademic reasons and therefore could not give a nonacademic SAC even though the nonacademic SAC may have been more appropriate for that particular student. Although, at one of those schools in which the board members reported not using nonacademic SACs, the chairman does, in fact, assign nonacademic SACs.

B. AGREEMENT IN DECISION MAKING

Besides procedural differences, differences in the ARB members' opinions about the importance of certain student factors for making a decision about a student may also contribute to either a lack of standardization or inaccurate attrition reporting. These factors were mentioned in Chapter II, e.g., the student's academic record, recommendations made to the board, etc. If there is little agreement among the board members, then it is highly likely that there is a great amount of variation in attrition reporting. There is a finite amount of information the ARB has available by which it can evaluate a student. Therefore, differences in weighing a student factor from one set of ARB members to another may elicit varied decisions.

Two sets of analyses were performed on the data. The first analysis consisted of the Friedman Two-Way Analysis of Variance by Ranks. This test determined whether the ARB members value all the student factors equally or if they give

some factors more weight than others. The values for the nine student factors were ranked for each ARB member and then the mean rank for each student factor was calculated. In this case the most highly valued student factor could receive a 9.0, while the least valued student factor could receive a 1.0. From the mean ranks, a test statistic with an approximate Chi-square distribution was calculated with the following formula:

$$X^2 = \frac{12}{Nk(k+1)} \sum_{j=1}^k (r_j)^2 - 3_N(k+1)$$

where:

N = number of ARB members,

k = number of student factors, and

R_j = sum of ranks in jth column. [Ref. 12:pp. 167-171]

The second analysis conducted was the Kendall's W Coefficient of Concordance. Kendall's W served as a measurement of agreement among the raters concerning the importance of the given student factors. A Kendall coefficient of $W = 1.0$ would indicate perfect agreement among the raters. Conversely, a coefficient of $W = 0$ would indicate no agreement. The procedures for calculating Kendall's W are similar to the Friedman test except that after the mean ranks are calculated, the sum of squares of the observed deviations from the mean ranks are calculated. From that information,

Kendall's W may be calculated by the following formula:

$$W = \frac{s}{12k^2(N^3 - N)}$$

where:

s = sum of squares of the observed deviations from the mean of R_j ,

$$s = \sum (R_j - \frac{\sum R_j}{N})^2$$

k = number of ARB members.

N = number of student factors judged.

R_j = sum of ranks, $j = 1$ to 9. [Ref. 12:pp. 229-237]

The analyses were performed for each of the four types of decisions from command-wide rankings, and then repeated by individual school groups.

1. Analysis of Command-Wide Responses

The first set of analyses considered the responses command-wide, i.e., all schools were combined. The results are shown in Table 7. The Friedman's Test indicated that the ARB members do not value all of the student factors equally. In other words, there are significant differences in the level of importance assigned to student factors for each of the four types of decisions. The data in Table 7 show the relative ranks followed by the mean rank of each student factor for each of the four types of decisions (1-9 with 1 as the most

important).¹ The presentation of the data will begin with a discussion of the rankings of student factors shown in Table 7, followed by a more detailed discussion of specific student factors, and finally a discussion of the levels of agreement among the ARB members as indicated by the Kendall's coefficient. All statistical values shown on Table 7 are significant at the level of $p < .01$.

TABLE 7
RELATIVE AND MEAN RANKINGS
OF STUDENT FACTORS FOR TYPE OF DECISION

Student	Academic setback	Nonacademic setback	Academic drop	Nonacademic drop
acadrec	2/2.77	6/5.17	1/2.24	6/5.42
milrec	7/5.68	2/3.59	7/5.80	2/2.44
persinfo	4/4.89	3/3.87	5/5.04	3/3.73
asvab	8/6.23	8/7.40	8/6.44	8/7.41
nghststdy	3/4.70	7/6.05	3/4.54	7/6.38
rectobrd	5/5.10	4/4.09	4/4.88	5/4.61
prfjdgmnt	6/4.26	5/4.51	6/5.36	4/4.49
stdtmot	1/2.29	1/2.39	2/2.54	1/2.27
hsdg	9/7.97	9/7.93	9/8.16	9/8.26
N	89	76	88	75
df	8	8	8	8
Friedman's Chi square	270.04	269.84	209.06	345.28
Kendall's Coefficient	.42	.50	.50	.64
Chi square	302.22	301.44	354.88	385.36

¹The mean rankings produced by the Friedman's analyses were subtracted from 10.0 to facilitate comparisons with the relative rankings.

For the academic type decisions, the student's academic record and attitude/motivation received similar mean ranks and were ranked much higher than any other student factor considered. In other words, academic record and motivation were ranked as the most important factors to consider when making a decision to setback or to drop a student for academic reasons.

For the nonacademic type decisions, the student's attitude/motivation was the most important factor for both nonacademic decisions. The student's military record was ranked very closely to student motivation for the nonacademic drop from training decision, and to a lesser extent for the nonacademic setback decision. Also, personal information was valued more strongly than the other student factors for the nonacademic type decisions.

Several student factors were ranked very closely together and comprised a mid-ranged group for a given type decision. The mid-ranged group included the remaining student factors, with the exception of those noted above, and the two lowest ranked student factors. The student's ASVAB scores and whether or not the student was a high school graduate (HSDG), were consistently ranked as the least important student factors to consider when making ARB decisions.

As noted, the student's motivation was ranked the highest for three of the four possible decisions and it was ranked second for the fourth decision. Even though there is

agreement about the value of evaluating student motivation (as will be shown below in the discussion of Kendall's coefficient), it is a highly subjective judgment that is rated by a number of different factors by the ARB members. There were over 25 different responses on what constitutes attitude/motivation. Table 8 presents the most common responses, by percentage of the total number of 210 responses received. Many of the ARB members gave more than one response.

TABLE 8
HOW MOTIVATION IS JUDGED
(Question 9)

How do you judge motivation (besides night study).

Participation in class	25%
Seeking help from instructors	19%
Completing homework	17%
Demonstrates extra effort	15%
Comments from instructors	10%
Rewrites class notes	7%
Miscellaneous	7%

Class participation was the most frequently mentioned measure of student attitude. It is followed by the group of measures shown on the table. Other, less common responses included whether or not the student makes eye

contact at the ARB, how sharp the student looks in uniform, and the "gut feeling" of the ARB member.

The student's ASVAB scores were ranked very low in importance for any type of decision being made. This seems surprising because the ASVAB scores are used as an entrance screen for most schools. Table 9 presents the responses concerning the usefulness of ASVAB scores for determining if the student's academic problems are legitimate or really a lack of motivation. The data are based on percentages of the 91 people who responded to the question. Over half of the respondents thought a student's ASVAB scores would be useful in judging student motivation. However, this contradicts the low mean rankings given to it by the same individuals.

TABLE 9

VALUE OF THE STUDENT'S
ASVAB SCORES TO THE ARB (Question 6)

Do ASVAB scores help you determine whether a student's academic problems are real or due to lack of motivation?

ASVAB scores are helpful	52.6%
ASVAB scores are not helpful	36.8%
Not sure	10.6%

It would appear that, conceptually, ARB members see value in ASVAB scores as an aid in decision making, which is reflected in Table 9. However, when compared to other sources of information on a relative basis, ASVAB scores are ranked at

a very low level (see Table 7).

Military record was rated highly for its value in making nonacademic type decisions. Yet, the manner in which information is obtained about the military record was varied. As stated earlier, some schools have one of the ASMT's instructional staff sit on the ARBs as a voting member. Other schools call the ASMT whenever the student is having academic problems to discover if the student is also having other problems that may have a contributing influence to the student's academic problems. The ARBs may also have the student's military record present at the board. The student's military record would contain information about the student's military performance, specifically noting any infractions the student might have committed. In some of the smaller schools, the academic instructors usually hear when a student is having problems at the ASMT.

When a student comes before an ARB, one of the first objectives is to determine the kinds of personal problems the student is having, if any. A student's personal problems may include family, financial, and medical problems. Table 10 presents the kinds of personal information that could help an ARB make a decision whether to setback or drop a student. Since ARB members could give more than one answer to this question, percentages are based on 245 responses.

TABLE 10

PERSONAL INFORMATION USED
BY THE ARB (Question 5)

What kind of personal information about the student might help you make a decision during an ARB?

A student's personal problems	56%
Attitude in class, study habits, effort	14%
Background (family, jobs, hometown)	7%
Education background	4%
Misc. (substance abuse, friends, after hours' habits, stress, depression, and goals)	19%

How a student is judged as a future sailor may have an affect on the ARB's decision. This factor was ranked between fourth and sixth as shown on Table 7. Table 11 presents the types of factors considered in making judgments about the student as a future sailor. The ARB members provided over 45 different factors used to make this judgment. The most common responses are shown on Table 11. The percentages shown on the table are based on 250 responses.

As described earlier, these data represent an average of all survey respondents. Thus, the next step in analyzing the data was to investigate the extent to which people agree on this set of averaged rankings. A simple inspection of the data indicates that there is not perfect agreement. For example, while motivation was ranked very

highly for three out of the four decisions, not everyone rated it as first (the values shown on Table 7 range from 2.27 to 2.39). However, it is not clear how much disparity there is.

TABLE 11

FACTORS CONSIDERED WHEN MAKING
PROFESSIONAL JUDGMENTS (Question 8)

How do you judge whether someone will make a good sailor?

Shows a positive attitude to complete the training	33%
Motivation, willingness to work, desire to excel, initiative	19%
Appearance and military bearing	17%
Behavior, class performance, study habits, follows direction, night study, asks questions	13%
Military record	7%
Various personality traits	6%
Respectful to seniors	5%

The Kendall's W provides a quantification on the level of agreement. The Kendall's coefficients ranged from a moderate level of agreement for the academic setback decision $W = .42$, to a higher level of agreement for the nonacademic drop from training decision $W = .64$. In other words, the Kendall's Statistic applied to these data indicates that there is a level of agreement that is significant, or non-random, for all decisions. Further, there is a higher level of

agreement among decision makers when dropping a student for nonacademic reasons as compared to other decisions.

2. Analysis of School-Level Responses

The remaining discussion of the level of agreement will focus on the four groups of schools. Particular attention will be paid to any differences that exist between the schools' rankings of the student factors. The Friedman's Two-Way Analysis of Variance by Ranks and Kendall's W Coefficient of Concordance were significant for all schools at the one percent level unless noted.

a. Setback for Academic Reasons

The schools' patterns of ranking the student factors (see Appendix C) followed the command-wide pattern with a few exceptions. For all schools, the highest ranked student factors were the student's academic record and the student's attitude/motivation. The mid-ranked student factors were also similarly ranked with the exception of RM-A school. RM-A school gave the student's ASVAB scores slightly higher mean and relative rankings. The other schools ranked the ASVAB scores as lowest in importance. Also, RM-A school valued the student's military record and their own professional judgment less than the other school groups.

The levels of agreement within the schools were statistically significant indicating that there is a non-random basis for ranking the student factors among the

school's ARB members. The least amount of agreement occurred within the 3300-level schools ($W = .43$), while the AES had the highest level of agreement ($W = .54$).

b. Setback for Nonacademic Reasons

The data table discussed in this section are presented in Appendix D. The RM-A school data were not statistically significant, most probably due to the small number of respondents, therefore the results from RM-A school will be omitted from the discussion.

The schools' patterns of ranking the student factors were similar to the command-wide rankings, with the exception of the AES. Student attitude/motivation was the highest ranked student factor for all the schools, and the student's military record was the second highest ranked student factor. The AES agreed with the ranking of the student's attitude/motivation as the highest student factor, but differed on the next two most important student factors. They valued their own professional judgment about the student and, to a slightly lesser extent, recommendations made to the board, much more than the other school groups. The remainder of the mid-ranged student factors were patterned similarly to the command-wide rankings. Also, all the schools ranked the student's ASVAB scores and HSDG as the least important of the student factors.

For this type of decision, the levels of agreement within each school were similar to each other and to

the command-wide rating with the exception of the AES, which had a high level of agreement ($W = .73$).

c. Drop for Academic Reasons

Once again the schools' patterns of ranking the student factors were very similar to the command-wide rankings (see Appendix E). The student's academic record and the student's attitude/motivation were ranked closely as the most important student factors. The mid-ranged student factors were ranked similarly to the group as a whole, and ASVAB scores and HSDG ranked as the least important student factors among all the schools.

The levels of agreement across the schools varied from RM-A school with the least level of agreement ($W = .47$) to the highest level at the AES ($W = .59$). There is slightly more certainty about the ranking of the student factors for the academic drop from training decision than there was for the academic setback decision.

d. Drop for Nonacademic Reasons

The data table summarized in this section is presented in Appendix F. The RM-A school data consisted of only two responses, therefore these results will not be discussed.

The schools' patterns of ranking the student factors closely matched the command-wide pattern of student factor rankings. The student's military record and the student's attitude/motivation were ranked closely and were the

two most important student factors. The schools ranked the mid-ranged student factors similarly, and ASVAB scores and HSDG were the least important student factors.

This type of decision produced the highest levels of agreement among the schools' ARB members. The 3300-level schools had the lowest level of agreement ($W = .62$), while the AES had the most agreement ($W = .77$).

Table 12 summarizes the Kendall's W Coefficient of Concordance statistics for the command-wide analysis and then for each school group. Overall, the analyses of the data from each separate school show the following trends:

1. RM-A school data were omitted from the discussions of nonacademic decisions due to the small number of respondents. RM-A instructional personnel declined to respond to these items because, at their ARBs, they do not evaluate the students for nonacademic reasons.
2. Agreement was only slightly higher within schools as compared to results produced by the command-wide analysis, with the exception of the AES. The AES had consistently higher agreement across all types of decisions.
3. There is more agreement among the ARB members concerning the importance of student factors for the decisions to drop a student from training as compared to setback decisions.
4. There is more agreement among ARB members concerning the importance of student factors for nonacademic as compared to academic decisions.

TABLE 12

AGREEMENT COEFFICIENTS BY SCHOOL GROUP
AND TYPE OF DECISION

Decision	Command- Wide	RM-A	IC/DP-A	3300- level	AES
Academic Setback	.42	.45	.46	.43	.54
Nonacademic Setback	.50	.47	.50	.48	.73
Academic Drop	.50	.47	.52	.55	.59
Nonacademic Drop	.64	.79	.65	.62	.77

C. ADDITIONAL ATTRITION-RELATED QUESTIONS

There is a growing concern by people involved with Navy enlisted training that, due to the addition of a SAC for voluntary disenrollment, there will be an increase in the number of students desiring to disenroll from training. A realistic job preview (RLJP) is one instrument that has been used to prevent that situation from occurring by portraying the perspective workplace through lectures, books, videos, etc. The ARB members were asked what effect they thought a RLJP would have in preventing attrition at their school. Their responses are given in Table 13. At least 60 percent of the ARB members thought a RLJP could be useful or would be very useful in preventing attrition at their school. The RLJP received the most support from the 3300-level schools and the least support from the AES (obviously, a RLJP would have less

value in a "C" School).

TABLE 13

VALUE OF A RLJP (Question 29)

How useful would a realistic job preview for this rating be in preventing attrition for any reason?

	RM-A	IC/DP-A	3300	AES
Not useful	15.4%	17.0%	11.8%	40.0%
Could be useful	46.2%	23.4%	11.8%	20.0%
Very useful	38.4%	59.6%	76.4%	40.0%
N	13	46	17	10

How the instructors and ARB members feel about the difficulty of their curriculum may affect their opinions about the students. Table 14 presents the percentages of ARB members who feel that the curriculum at their school is either too hard, too easy, or about right.

TABLE 14

DIFFICULTY OF THE
SCHOOL'S CURRICULUM (Question 28)

In consideration of what your students will have to do when they eventually perform in their rating, rate the curriculum here.

	RM-A	IC/DP-A	3300	AES
a. too hard	8.3%	31.3%	0	9.1%
b. too easy	75.0%	8.3%	0	81.8%
c. about right	16.7%	60.4%	100%	9.1%
N	12	48	17	11

The final question asked the ARB members whether their school's attrition had gone up, down, or stayed about the same, and why. The responses are presented in Table 15.

TABLE 15

ARB MEMBER'S PERCEPTIONS
ABOUT THE CHANGE IN ATTRITION (Question 24)

In the time that you have been here, has attrition gone up, down, or stayed about the same? Why?

	RM-A	IC/DP-A	3300	AES
Stayed the same	0%	9.8%	29.4%	100%
Down, due to: pressure or lowered standards	83.3%	51.2%	0%	0%
Down, due to: improved students or methods	16.7%	9.8%	64.7%	0%
Gone up	0%	29.2%	5.9%	0%
N	12	41	17	11

About 83 percent of the respondents from RM-A school and close to 51 percent of the respondents from IC/DP-A school indicated that attrition had gone down. The two reasons given for the decline in attrition were lowered grading standards and the pressure they had received from their superiors to lower attrition. Twenty nine percent of the respondents from IC/DP-A school stated that attrition had increased. Conversely, over 66 percent of the 3300-level schools respondents indicated that attrition had gone down due to improved training methods and extra effort from the instructors. All of the AES respondents stated that their attrition has remained about the same.

It is interesting to note that the RM-A and IC-A schools are among the 15 schools that have high attrition, and also have members who are the most concerned about pressure to reduce attrition through reduced lowered standards. These instructors have apparently made some assumptions concerning attrition policy.

While the data collected for the last three questions presented here are only indirectly related to attrition reporting, they are nonetheless highly relevant to the decisions made at ARBs. For example, an instructor who perceives that standards have been lowered to reduce attrition may be influenced in two ways. First, if the instructor believes that standards have already been lowered for course tests (or curriculum), he/she may be more likely to be

unnecessarily stringent in standards applied to the decision to setback or drop. The result could be inappropriate attrition.

On the other hand, if the instructor perceives incorrectly that the concern with reducing attrition is such that it is his/her job to apply lowered standards, that person may play a part in creating a problem that doesn't exist. The result in this situation would be to reduce attrition at the expense of quality student output--the very outcome of concern to a number of the instructors surveyed.

Thus, indirect factors can affect attrition rates in non-optimal ways. These issues would seem to merit additional exploration.

IV. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A. CONCLUSIONS

This research examined the school's attrition process, specifically focusing on those areas that could result in either inaccurate attrition reporting or decreased standardization among the attrition reporting schools. The study looked at three general areas at one Navy training organization: 1) procedural differences, 2) differences in the levels of agreement concerning various student factors, and 3) ARB member's perceptions.

1. Procedural Differences

The ARB procedures differ across schools. Those differences may contribute to decreased standardization in attrition reporting among the schools. Most of the differences appear to be due to varying interpretations of CNTECHTRA INST. 1540.46A, while others exist because of the school's policy, e.g., the chairman as the only member to assign the SACs, or not assigning a nonacademic SAC because it is an Academic Review Board.

2. Levels Of Agreement

Without an explicit policy governing what student information should be considered, there exist remarkable similarities among the schools concerning the value certain student factors contribute to the ARB's decision making process. However, the ARB member's judgement about the characteristics that make-up some of those student factors varies. Also, the ARB members within the schools have moderate to high levels of agreement concerning the importance of the student factors.

3. ARB Member's Perceptions

The board members' perceptions about the school's effectiveness in performing its mission may affect the accuracy of attrition reporting. Specifically, perceptions about course difficulty and lowering standards to meet attrition goals, may influence instructor morale and ARB decision making.

4. Outcomes Of ARB Decisions

Finally, it is important to add that the accuracy of current ARB decisions is unknown. Even if standardization of decisions within and across ARBs could be achieved, there have been no measures of the outcomes of any decisions made, i.e., there is no way of knowing if decisions made are correct.

B. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Consider the differences in board procedures to determine if there may be value in changing procedures to be consistent across all schools. The following areas should be reviewed:
 - a. Should a student's instructor be present at the board?
 - b. Should permanent chairpersons be assigned for all ARBs, or should the job be rotated?
 - c. Is it more useful to conduct a board in a relaxed, informal manner or in a more traditionally military, formal environment?
 - d. To what extent should an ARB consider military performance, and how should the board acquire that

information?

- e. Should policy be established with respect to number of setbacks allowed for each student?
- f. Should all board members be equally knowledgeable about SACs?
- g. Should the chairman, vice the board, have sole responsibility for assigning the SAC?

2. Consider the value placed on each of the student factors in decision making to determine if the rankings are consistent with the best interests of Navy training.

3. Given the consistently high level of agreement between AES board members, determine if there is something about the way they conduct their ARBs that can be transitioned for use at the "A" schools.

4. Explore expanded use of realistic job previews as a tool for reducing attrition.

5. Explore ARB members' understanding of attrition policy implications.

6. Investigate the fleet performance of marginal students, as determined by test scores or number of setbacks.

7. Conduct a cost analysis. The cost effectiveness of setting back students from training, as opposed to dropping them, might provide useful information for decision making.

8. Determine the generalizability of the present data to other enlisted training schools.

This study is the initial attempt at analyzing the intricacies

of decision making at ARBs. The follow-on studies recommended would take the issues and questions addressed here to the next logical level of analysis. Specifically, performance and cost data associated with students who have academic difficulties would provide a concrete basis from which to derive policy concerning acceptable levels of attrition at Navy "A" schools.

LIST OF REFERENCES

1. Center for Naval Analyses, CRM 86-26, An Evaluation of the Effectiveness of Classroom and On-The-Job Training, by Q. Aline, and A. J. Marcus, February 1986.
2. Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Military Manpower Training Report 1991, 1990.
3. Center for Naval Analyses, CRM 88-76, The Role of Student Quality in A-School Training Attrition: Trends in Selected Ratings, Byrnes, P.E., Marcus, A.J., and Thomason, J.E., July 1988.
4. Training Analysis and Evaluation Group, Vol. 75, The Relationship of Personality Characteristics to Attrition and Performance Problems of Navy and Air Force Recruits, Spielberger, C.D., and Barker, L.R., September 1979.
5. Center for Naval Analyses, CRM 88-149, A-School Attrition and Results, Byrnes, P.E., and Marcus, A. J., September 1988.
6. CNET MSG 2521582, June 1987.
7. Navy Personnel Research and Development Center, in press, The Model School Process, by Van Matre, N., 1990.
8. CNET MSG 1720502, July 1989.
9. CNTECHTRAINST 1540.46A.
10. Wright, G. Behavioral Decision Making, Plenum Press, New York, 1985.
11. Chief of Naval Technical Training, NITRAS Extract.
12. Siegel, Sidney, Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences, McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1956.

APPENDIX A

INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF REPRESENTATION BY SCHOOL

SCHOOL	TOTAL STAFF	TOTAL STUDIED	PERCENT STAFF
RM-A	102	14	13.7
IC-A	62	44	71.0
DP-A	8	4	50.0
MS-A	33	6	18.2
PM/ML-A	10	3	30.0
MR-A	20	9	45.0
AES	209	11	5.3

APPENDIX B

ARB QUESTIONNAIRE

The purpose of this survey is to look at how your organization conducts its Academic Review Boards. We are interested in understanding how decisions are made. In other words, what kind of information do you use in making a decision? We are particularly interested in the importance you give to different factors and any unique factors you may consider. This will allow us to better understand the decision making process.

Your answers are anonymous, your command will not have any access to these questionnaires, and any information reported will be aggregated so no one answer will be singled out.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Rank/Paygrade _____

Years of service _____

Time at this command _____

Approximate number of times you
have sat on an ARB _____

Approximate number of times you have
served as chair of an ARB _____

THE ARB PROCESS

Please consider the specific types of decisions described below and in the spaces next to each factor indicate the following:

- a. How important each type of information is in leading to that particular decision. Use a 1-5 scale where
- 1 = not at all important; rarely used
 - 2 = somewhat important
 - 3 = average importance
 - 4 = very important
 - 5 = extremely important; critical factor

b. The rank of each of the factors compared to the others for that particular decision. You will have ranks 1-9 if you use only the factors we have suggested, or more if you can think of factors to add on that we have neglected to include. We encourage you strongly to try to add factors anywhere you can to make sure we have an accurate understanding of the ARB process.

1. For your first set of ratings and rankings, consider a typical situation (we know there are unique situations, try to focus on the average) in which the board decides that a student should be **setback for academic reasons**. Now evaluate how important the following factors were in helping you reach this decision:

	<u>Importance</u>	<u>Rank</u>
Academic record	_____	_____
Military record	_____	_____
Personal information about the student	_____	_____
ASVAB scores	_____	_____
Amount of night study	_____	_____
Recommendations made to the board	_____	_____
Your professional judgment about whether this person will make a good sailor	_____	_____
Student attitude/motivation	_____	_____
High school graduate (or not)	_____	_____
Other: _____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

2. For the next set of ratings and rankings, consider the situation in which the decision is made to **setback the student for non-academic reasons.**

	<u>Importance</u>	<u>Rank</u>
Academic record	_____	_____
Military record	_____	_____
Personal information about the student	_____	_____
ASVAB scores	_____	_____
Amount of night study	_____	_____
Recommendations made to the board	_____	_____
Professional judgement about whether this person will make a good sailor	_____	_____
Student attitude/motivation	_____	_____
High school graduate (or not)	_____	_____
Other: _____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

3. Now consider the situation in which the decision is made to **drop a student from training for academic reasons.**

	<u>Importance</u>	<u>Rank</u>
Academic record	_____	_____
Military record	_____	_____
Personal information about the student	_____	_____
ASVAB Scores	_____	_____
Amount of night study	_____	_____
Recommendations made to the board	_____	_____

Professional judgment about whether this person will make a good sailor	_____	_____
Student attitude/motivation	_____	_____
High school graduate (or not)	_____	_____
Other _____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

4. Now consider the situation in which the board decides to drop a student from training for non-academic reasons.

	<u>Importance</u>	<u>Rank</u>
Academic record	_____	_____
Military record	_____	_____
Personal information about the student	_____	_____
ASVAB scores	_____	_____
Amount of night study	_____	_____
Recommendations made to the board	_____	_____
Professional judgment about whether this person will make a good sailor	_____	_____
Student attitude/motivation	_____	_____
High school graduate (or not)	_____	_____
Other _____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

17. After any disagreements are discussed and a decision has been made, indicate the percent of the time you feel

- a. Satisfied with the decision made: ____ percent.
- b. That you still disagree with the decision: ____ percent.

18. Where did you learn how to participate in academic review boards? List all sources and check the one that provided you with the most/best information.

STUDENT ACTION CODES

19. Which of the SACs are confusing or hard to use in any way, and why?

20. If you could add more SACs to those you have available to you (in order to increase the accuracy of the system), what would they be?

21. Is there any reason you avoid using particular codes? Which ones, and why?

22. Is there any reason you would lean toward using either an academic or non-academic drop code for a person who appeared to be about equally unable and unmotivated to complete the course?

Which type code would you use and why?

SCHOOL INFORMATION

23. What are the most common causes of attrition at this school?

24. In the time that you have been here, has attrition gone up, down, or stayed about the same?

If up, why?

If down, why?

25. How much communication is there here between the Military Training Divisions and the academic sections on student progress?

(circle one)

- a. None
- b. Occasional
- c. Considerable

26. From what you have seen, about what percentage of students with waivers are eventually dropped from training?

About _____ percent.

27. What is the maximum number of setbacks you would give **any** student?

Is that number based on your own feelings, or guidance from your command?

28. In consideration of what your students will have to do when they eventually go out to perform in their rating, is the curriculum here

(circle your answer)

- a. too hard
- b. too easy
- c. about right

29. About how often do you think the problems leading to attrition are a result of a student having unrealistic/inaccurate expectations of what the job/rating involves? Give a percentage that reflects your best guess.

_____ percent.

30. At this point, please add anything that we have not included that will help us to have a complete understanding of ARBs, student action codes, and the way you do business at this school.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME.

APPENDIX C

SETBACK FOR ACADEMIC REASONS BY SCHOOL GROUP

Student Factor	RM-A	IC/DP-A	3300	AES
acadrec	1/2.39	2/2.34	2/3.89	2/3.23
milrec	8/6.82	6/5.55	7/5.64	6/4.82
persinfo	3/4.18	4/4.98	5/4.69	7/5.77
asvab	6/5.43	8/5.96	8/6.78	8/7.50
nghtstdy	5/4.93	3/4.92	3/4.28	3/4.18
rectobrd	4/4.39	7/5.71	4/4.53	4/4.36
prfjdgmnt	7/6.04	5/5.30	6/4.92	5/4.68
stdtmot	2/3.07	1/2.29	1/2.19	1/2.27
hsdg	9/7.75	9/7.95	9/8.08	9/8.18
N	14	46	18	11
df	8	8	8	8
Friedman's Chi square	44.24	152.81	55.26	42.18
Kendall's coefficient	.45	.46	.43	.54
Chi square	50.60	169.21	62.40	47.30

APPENDIX D

DROP FOR ACADEMIC REASONS BY SCHOOL GROUP

Student Factor	RM-A	IC/DP-A	3300	AES
acadrec	1/2.38	1/2.11	1/1.94	2/3.14
milrec	7/6.12	7/5.51	7/6.03	7/6.23
persinfo	4/5.08	4/5.10	4/4.75	6/5.23
asvab	8/6.35	8/6.09	8/7.00	8/7.09
nghtstdy	5/5.31	3/4.61	3/4.17	4/3.95
rectobrd	3/3.81	5/5.34	6/5.14	3/3.82
prfjdgmnt	6/5.65	6/5.49	5/5.06	5/5.00
stdtmot	2/2.62	2/2.48	2/2.83	1/2.23
hsdg	9/7.69	9/8.28	9/8.08	9/8.32
N	13	46	18	11
df	8	8	8	8
Friedman's Chi square	42.95	168.37	70.49	44.87
Kendall's coefficient	.47	.52	.55	.59
Chi square	48.95	190.96	78.82	51.54

APPENDIX E

SETBACK FOR NONACADEMIC REASONS BY SCHOOL GROUP

Student Factor	RM-A	IC/DP-A	3300	AES
acadrec	5/4.75	6/4.96	7/5.35	6/6.00
milrec	2/3.12	2/3.46	2/3.79	4/4.05
persinfo	4/4.12	3/3.68	3/4.09	5/4.25
asvab	8/7.12	8/7.33	8/7.38	8/7.85
nghtstdy	7/6.87	7/6.27	6/4.97	7/6.55
rectobrd	1/2.62	4/4.16	5/4.71	3/3.30
prfjdgmnt	6/5.62	5/4.84	4/4.21	2/3.05
stdtmot	3/3.50	1/2.44	1/3.35	1/1.80
hsdg	9/7.25	9/7.87	9/8.15	9/8.05
N	4	45	17	10
df	8	8	8	8
Friedman's Chi square	13.72*	160.02	58.28	53.13
Kendall's coefficient	.47	.50	.48	.73
Chi square	15.20*	179.13	65.33	58.65

* Nonsignificant $p > .05$

APPENDIX F

DROP FOR NONACADEMIC REASONS BY SCHOOL GROUP

Student Factor	RM-A	IC/DP-A	3300	AES
acadrec	5/5.25	6/5.15	6/5.68	6/6.25
milrec	4/4.75	1/2.20	2/2.56	2/3.10
persinfo	1/2.25	3/3.79	3/3.88	3/3.45
asvab	8/7.75	8/7.26	8/7.47	8/7.90
nghtstdy	7/7.00	7/6.38	7/6.09	7/6.75
rectobrd	2/2.75	5/4.91	5/4.68	4/3.44
prfjdgmnt	5/5.25	4/4.66	4/4.26	5/3.90
stdtmot	3/3.25	2/2.29	1/2.21	1/2.10
hsdg	9/7.75	9/8.35	9/8.18	9/8.10
N	2	46	17	10
df	8	8	8	8
Friedman's Chi square	9.73*	214.75	75.92	54.24
Kendall's coefficient	.79	.65	.62	.77
Chi square	12.69*	237.66	84.50	61.46

* Nonsignificant $p > .05$

Distribution List

<u>Agency</u>	<u>No. of copies</u>
Defense Technical Information Center Cameron Station Alexandria, VA 22314	2
Dudley Knox Library, Code 0142 Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, CA 93943	2
Office of Research Administration Code 012 Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, CA 93943	1
Library, Center for Naval Analyses 4401 Ford Avenue Alexandria, VA 22302-0268	1
Department of Administrative Sciences Library Code AS Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, CA 93943	1
Chief of Naval Operations (OP-112C1) Washington, DC 20350-2000	2
Chief of Naval Technical Training (Code N6-A) Naval Air Station Bldg. C-1 Millington, TN 38054-5056	5
Alice M. Crawford Code AS/Cr Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, CA 93943	10
Robert L. Firehammer SWOS Department Head School Class 115 Newport, Rhode Island 02840	2



3 2768 00347393 5